

to be in a way  
with yourself &  
strengthen your hands.  
This I suppose could  
not be done except  
by your assent &  
action of Parliament.  
And I will certainly  
be glad to ask if you  
think it could  
be all arranged  
if you decide  
H.D. Rawnsley

Recd.  
Oct. 24/93.

H.D. Rawnsley PR Box 2/R4



Xtwaite  
Keswick  
24/15

Dear Sir  
Will you kindly tell me  
what is the actual  
position of the Department  
of which you are Head  
for the Protection of Ancient  
Monuments -  
And I right in writing  
if you are not  
a corporation, and have

really no power to  
hold land - non-acquire

(2) it -  
that you are a sub  
department of the  
world + forest.

Task because many of  
us are of opinion that  
the time has come for  
farming - must be  
be incorporated under

the Companies act.  
that shall be able  
to acquire + hold lands  
for the natives and  
that are really interesting  
sites because of  
their natural beauty  
or of their historic worth.

and we are anxious in no  
way to trench upon  
ground already covered

Indeed it has been  
my hope that it would  
be possible perhaps.

Ans'd  
Oct. 24/93

X The White Vicarage RA  
Kerwick

H. D. Rawnsley PR Box 21

TYN-Y-FYNON,  
BARMOUTH,  
NORTH WALES.

Oct 22

Dear Sir

I write again fearing my  
letter may have been  
misaddressed. to ask  
if it would in your  
judgment be possible for  
the Antiquary  
Protection Department to  
continue with a  
Natural Scenery & Historic  
Site Trust which we

we about to form  
this trust will be  
incorporated under  
the Companies Act  
& will be empowered to  
hold any land bequeathed  
for the National use  
& enjoyment or to  
obtain by purchase  
any British House or  
site that ought to be  
preserved.

Lord Rothery is anxious  
to know if your Department  
would <sup>be able</sup> cooperate with  
such a Trust and cannot  
say - my own idea is  
that you are not  
a Corporation & cannot  
hold land.

Yours truly,  
H. D. Rothery

we are willing not  
to multiply organizations.

FR Box 2/124

Rushmore,  
Salisbury.

Oct. 24th, 1893.

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letters of the 15th and 22nd Oct., which press of business has prevented my answering sooner, I ~~am~~ enclose a copy of the Ancient Monuments Act, which will show you what the powers of the Act are. The question of enlarging the scope of the Act has been frequently suggested, but it is quite out of my power to say what the intention of the Government, if any, might be on the subject. I may, however, say that our experience has been that, in so far as prehistoric Monuments are concerned, it has been found, that the owners of them, when they take an interest in them, as most do, are by far the best protectors of them, being generally on the spot, and having as a rule the means of doing so.

A good deal was done during the first 7 years of the Act, which resulted in drawing public attention to the interest that is taken in the matter. This had a salutary effect, and I think that very little damage is being done to Ancient Monuments now. My department is under the Office of Works.

As to the question of including historical and picturesque sites under the Act, or any other Act, that is a large question, which I am not competent to deal with. It is possible there might be special cases in which such powers might be advantageous, but as a rule, my own opinion is that private owners are the best protectors of such places. They are nearly always accessible to the public, and that it is better to give them every encouragement, than to attempt to take them out of their hands, which would entail an enormous expense on Government; and there is no reason to suppose any Government would be willing to incur such an outlay, and it would probably be very badly administered.

Yours obediently,

but as a rule my own opinion  
is that private owners are  
the best protectors of such places.  
They are nearly always accessible to  
the public & that it is better  
to fear them may encroach  
than to attempt to take them  
out of their hands. But would  
not our numerous express or  
Government? <sup>and</sup> There is no  
reason to suppose any Government  
would be willing to incur <sup>such an outlay</sup> & it  
would probably be very badly  
administered

Yours sincerely  
Wm. Deane

PR Box 2114

Rushmore,  
Salisbury.

Oct 24 '93.

Dear Sir

In reply to your letter of the  
15<sup>th</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> Oct. I am sorry I  
was prevented by answering sooner. I  
enclose a copy of the Ancient  
Monuments Act which will show  
you that the purpose of the Act was  
the function of enlarging the scope of the  
act has been frequently supplied.  
But it is quite out of my power  
to say that the intention of the

Government of any <sup>might</sup> ~~subject~~  
other subject. I may however  
say that our experience has been  
that in so far as ~~preference~~  
monuments are concerned it has  
been found that the owners of  
them when the bills are introduced  
then as most do. are by far  
the best protectors of them being  
usually on the spot & having as  
a rule the means of doing so  
a good deal was done during the  
past 7 years of the act. This resulted  
in drawing public attention to the

interest that is taken in the  
matter. After that a  
Salisbury effect & I think that  
very little damage is being  
done to ancient monuments now.  
My department is under the  
office of works.  
as to the question of including historical  
& picturesque sites under the act  
on any other Act. That is a large  
question which I am not competent  
to deal with. It is possible that  
there might be special cases in which  
such works might be advantageous